

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 24, 2004. Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95, and 98 to 112 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to formal matters involving the drawings, it is respectfully requested to receive an indication of approval for the formal drawings submitted with the Letter dated October 12, 2001.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, all claims were rejected based on citations to European 952,513 (White), U.S. Patent 6,820,124 (Clough), and U.S. Patent 6,628,413 (Lee). Specifically, Claims 1 to 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19 to 23, 28 to 36, 38, 39, 42, 43, 47 to 51, 56 to 64, 66, 67, 70, 71, 75 to 79, 84 to 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 103 to 107 and 112 were all rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over White. Additionally, Claims 9, 37, 65 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White in view of Clough; and Claims 12, 13, 16 to 18, 24 to 27, 40, 41, 44 to 46, 52 to 55, 68, 69, 72 to 74, 80 to 83, 96, 97, 100 to 102 and 108 to 111 were all rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White in view of Lee. In response, claims like dependent Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled, and the subject matter similar thereof has been added to each of the independent claims, with the caveat that the print queue is published according to “user-configurable parameters”. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection over White in view of

Lee, for which reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested, as detailed more fully below.

The invention concerns management of a plurality of printing devices connected on a network, and involves creation and publication of a print queue for a printing device connected to the network. The printing device is detected and information from the printing device is requested. The requested information is received and a print queue is created for the printing device based on the received information. According to one feature of the invention, user-configurable parameters for the print queue are accessed, and the print queue is published to the network according to the user-configurable parameters.

According to more detailed aspects of the invention set forth in dependent claims like Claims 14 and 15, the user-configurable parameters might include an IP address, a MAC address, a print queue name, print queue policies, a server associated with the print queue, and printing capabilities corresponding to the printing device.

By virtue of the foregoing, in which the print queue is published according to user-configurable parameters, the invention provides for customization of the print queue if desired by the user. At least the foregoing features are not seen in the applied art.

Specifically, in entering the rejection of claims like Claims 12 and 13, although the Office Action was somewhat unclear in its rationale, it apparently made a tacit concession that White does not show publication of a print queue to a network, much less publication according to a set of predetermined rules. Lee's Figure 3 was apparently relied on for this feature, but it is respectfully submitted that Lee's Figure 3 is not seen to disclose

or suggest anything concerning publication of a print queue to a network according to user-configurable parameters.

Specifically, it is Applicants' position that Lee's Figure 3 is directed to a print driver and not to a print queue. One indicator of this may be seen in header 122 of Lee's Figure 3, which is entitled "printer configuration". Moreover, Lee describes his Figure 3 at column 5 in the following words:

"The returned page 131 allows the system administrator to establish paper size by choosing one of the radio buttons selecting A4 paper, 8.5x11 paper or legal size paper. Also, the default tray is specified, allowing the system administrator to choose between letterhead paper and plain paper. ...

"In fact, any parameter usually set by buttons on a printer can be set through the standard WWW interface." (Lines 3 to 8 and 11 to 13 of Lee's column 5).

Other figures (like Figures 4 and 5) in Lee bear a header 122 entitled "queue manager", but Applicants believe that these figures still refer to configuration of a printer driver, and not a print queue published to a network. As an example, Figures 4 and 5 are discussed in the paragraphs bridging Lee's columns 5 and 6, from which it is Applicants' belief that these figures discuss configuration of a print driver and not a print queue published to a network.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the art applied in the rejections does not anticipate or render the claimed invention obvious, and allowance of the claims herein is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 92558v1